

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated October 31, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 8-10 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 14-23 are new.

Interview Summary

A brief telephone interview was conducted January 8, 2009 between the Examiner and the undersigned. During the interview it was discussed the reasons for the rejection of claim 8 and the reasons for allowance of claim 1.

102 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McDowell (U.S. Pat. App. 20020035605). Applicants do not concede to the merits of the rejection. However, to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant's have cancelled claims 8 and 9. The cancelling of these claims renders the 102 rejection moot.

103 Rejections

Claims 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDowell in view of Doss (U.S. Pat. App. 2002/0188620). Applicants do not concede to the merits of the rejection. However, to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant's have cancelled claims 10 and 13. The cancelling of these claims renders the 103 rejection moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 11-12 and 14-17

The Office Action has found claims 1-2, 4-7 and 11-12 allowable. New claims 14-17 depend from allowable claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 7.

Claims 18-23

Claims 18-23 are new. Claim 18 recites features not described by McDowell or Doss. For example, claim 18 recites, “initiating a first application on the first computing device, the first application accessing and retrieving legacy data from a remote system within a private network,” and “initiating a second application on the first computing device, the second application providing an instant messaging service.” Thus, claim 18 recites a first application on the first computing device retrieving legacy data and a second application on the first computing device providing instant messaging services. McDowell describes enabling instant messaging on a mobile device but fails to describe a first application retrieving legacy data from a remote system where the first application is distinct from a second application that provides instant messaging capabilities as recited by claim 18. Doss fails to account for the noted deficiency. Thus, neither McDowell or Doss describes or suggest every feature of claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is allowable for at least this reason. Claims 19-23 depend from claim 18 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-2, 4-7, 11-12 and 14-23 are in condition for allowance. Applicants request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2009

/Daniel J. Layden/
Daniel J. Layden
Reg. No. 60,921

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(770) 643-8912